



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/655,871	09/06/2000	Atle Raestad	3842-3	9649

7590 03/10/2004

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.,
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

ADAMS, JONATHAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/655,871

Applicant(s)

RAESTAD ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan R Adams

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/06/2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the preliminary amendment filed on 09/06/2000.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.
3. Foreign Priority has been granted to 09/06/1999.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
5. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 2-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
7. The further use of "an authentication proxy" does not clearly distinguish the claimed number of intended authentication proxies. If only one authentication proxy is intended, the identifier "an" should be replaced with "said". One authentication proxy has been assumed for the following action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
9. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
 - (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
10. Claims 1, 2, and 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being preceded by Naudus, US patent No. 6259691 (hereafter referred to as '691).
11. As to claim 1 '691 teaches a network-based telephone system using the H.323 video conferencing standard:
12. H.323 with one or more gatekeepers / The gatekeeper 22 provides address translation and control access to the network for H.323 endpoints such as H.323 terminals (Col. 7, Line 38 et seq., '691)
13. Authentication proxy / The local gateway 40 may include a call process driver to perform call authentication (Col. 9, Line 39 et seq., '691)
14. As to claim 2:
15. Security profile used by authentication proxy / Gateway performs call authentication, call authorization, billing, interactive voice prompts and other call processing functions (Col. 9, Line 39 et seq., '691)
16. As to claim 4:

17. Authentication proxy communicates with gatekeeper with v2 RAS message /

The local gateway 40 sends a RAS ARQ message to the gatekeeper (Col. 10, Line 7 et seq., '691)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

19. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 3, 5, and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naudus, US patent No. 6259691, in view of Krishnaswamy et al., US patent No. 5999525 (hereafter referred to as '525)

21. As to claims 3, 5, and 6:

22. '691 teaches a network-based telephone system using the H.323 video conferencing standard, comprising end-user information entered by DTMF (Col. 9, Line 55 et seq., '691). '691 does not teach for the end-user information to be entered by means of a non-proprietary communications protocol, http, or html form. '525 teaches a method for video telephony over a hybrid network using the H.323 standard including the entry of end-user information by way of a web page (Col. 137, Line 1 et seq., '525). It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the end-user information update method of '525 with the invention of '691. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine these inventions because to do so would provide added convenience to the user, as it is quicker and easier to perform text modifications and manipulations by Internet means.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan R Adams whose telephone number is (703) 305-8894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 10am to 6pm.
24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306
25. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100